

# Maximally discordant mixed states of two qubits

Fernando Galve, Gian Luca Giorgi, and Roberta Zambrini  
*IFISC (UIB-CSIC), Instituto de Física Interdisciplinar y Sistemas Complejos,  
 UIB Campus, E-07122 Palma de Mallorca, Spain*  
 (Dated: April 1, 2022)

We study the relative strength of classical and quantum correlations, as measured by discord, for two-qubit states. Quantum correlations appear only in presence of classical ones, while the reverse is not always true. We identify the family of states maximizing the discord for a given value of the classical correlations showing that largest attainable discord for mixed states is greater than for pure ones. The difference between discord and entanglement is emphasized by the remarkable fact that these states do not maximize entanglement being in some cases even separable. Finally, by random generation of density matrices uniformly distributed over the whole Hilbert space, we quantify the frequency of appearance of quantum and classical correlations for different ranks.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ta, 42.50.Dv

One of the most striking features of quantum mechanics is entanglement, first considered (though not by that name) by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen in their seminal paper in 1935 [1]. This is an exclusively *quantum* feature of composite states, that cannot be written as mixtures of product states. Theoretical and experimental research activity to characterize entanglement has been particularly intense in the last decade (see review [2] and references therein), being part of a broader endeavor exploring distinctive aspects of quantum vs. classical physics [ref] and novel resources for quantum information purposes [3]. An important issue considered by several authors [4–6] is the existence of quantum correlations *beyond* entanglement, in separable states. As a matter of fact, examples of improved quantum computing tasks *not* relying on entanglement have been reported [7].

*Quantum correlations: the discord.*— Two complementary approaches on quantum correlations are receiving great attention [4, 5]. In Ref. [4], quantum correlations (quantum discord) have been associated to the difference of two classically equivalent expressions for the mutual information,  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$ . In particular, the quantum mutual information is defined as  $\mathcal{I}(\varrho) = S(\varrho_A) + S(\varrho_B) - S(\varrho)$  where  $S$  stands for the von Neumann entropy, and  $\varrho_{A(B)}$  is the reduced density matrix of each subsystem. The classically equivalent expression stemming from Bayes rule is  $\mathcal{J}(\varrho)_{\{\Pi_j^B\}} = S(\varrho_A) - S(A|\{\Pi_j^B\})$ , with the conditional entropy defined as  $S(A|\{\Pi_j^B\}) = \sum_i p_i S(\varrho_{A|\Pi_i^B})$ ,  $p_i = \text{Tr}_{AB}(\Pi_i^B \varrho)$  and where  $\varrho_{A|\Pi_i^B} = \Pi_i^B \varrho \Pi_i^B / p_i$  is the density matrix after the complete projective measurement ( $\{\Pi_j^B\}$ ) has been performed on B. Quantum discord is obtained minimizing the difference  $\mathcal{I}(\varrho) - \mathcal{J}(\varrho)$

$$\delta_{A:B}(\varrho) = \min_{\{\Pi_i^B\}} [S(\varrho_B) - S(\varrho) + S(A|\{\Pi_i^B\})], \quad (1)$$

that is, when measurement is performed in the basis which disturbs the state the least. A complementary approach was described in Ref. [5], defining classical corre-

lations and showing that total correlations given by the mutual information are actually larger than the sum of the classical ones and entanglement. As a matter of fact, the quantum mutual information can be seen as the sum of quantum correlations [4]  $\delta_{A:B}(\varrho)$  and the classical correlations [5]  $\max_{\{\Pi_j^B\}} \mathcal{J}(\varrho)_{\{\Pi_j^B\}}$ .

In contrast with state separability, this new paradigm of quantumness of correlations is measurement oriented, considering an experiment where all information of a system A is extracted by measuring another system B. According to this measure, a state is classically correlated only when consecutive measurements of system B yield the same picture of the state of system A, which is achieved after decoherence into the pointer basis of B [4, 8]. For pure states quantum discord is equivalent to entanglement and has actually the same value of classical correlations [5]. On the other hand, when mixed states are considered, entanglement does significantly depart from the quantum discord, their difference being positive for some states and negative for others [10]. As the definition of discord comes from a minimization over all possible measurement basis, only few general results have been reported. Analytic expressions are known for states of 2 qubits with maximally mixed marginals [10], for ‘X-shaped’ states [11] and also for Gaussian states of continuous variable systems [12].

In this Letter we explore the whole Hilbert space of two qubits to gain insight on their correlations, for mixed states of different ranks. Our main goal is to discern to which proportion the correlations between two qubits are either classical or quantum. We find the most nonclassical two-qubit states, that is the family with maximal quantum discord versus classical correlations, formed by mixed states of rank 2 and 3, which we name maximally discordant mixed states (MDMS). The analogous effort to identify largest deviations from classical states has led to mixed states maximizing entanglement versus purity (MEMS) [13]. At difference from MEMS, where a geometrical property such as separability could be consid-

ered with several constraints, the MDMS are naturally defined and allow to quantify the relative strength of quantum and classical correlations which are related in a closed form. The MDMS proposed here do not maximize entanglement for a given amount of classical correlations, and part of them are in fact separable. This pinpoints the fundamental difference between entanglement and discord for mixed states, in opposition to their exact equivalence for pure states. Their discord also implies that quantum correlations are always accompanied by classical ones, while the reverse is not always true. Furthermore, we study the probability of states with a given amount of discord in the whole two-qubit Hilbert space, supporting the recent result that the closed set of purely classically correlated states ( $\delta_{A:B} = 0$ ) have measure zero [14], and we compare with the probability for classical correlations and entanglement. Only such states with no discord have been shown to ensure a future nonnegative evolution in presence of dissipation [15], while discord cannot be made zero in a finite time by any Markovian map [14]. Furthermore, even in the presence of a noisy environment, for some family of initial states, discord can be robust under decoherence for a finite time [9]. First experimental results with polarization entangled photons have also recently been reported [16].

*Mixed states with largest discord.*— Being pure states with maximum entanglement also maximally discordant, Bell states are a natural starting point to identify states with large discord, and thus by mixing these states with other components it is quite plausible that we find states with a large proportion of quantum versus classical correlations.

We then consider an example of mixture of any Bell state  $|\psi\rangle$  with another orthogonal pure state, i.e.  $\varrho = \epsilon|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + (1 - \epsilon)|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ . If  $|\phi\rangle$  is any other Bell state then  $\delta_{A:B} = E$  (with  $E$  entanglement) and  $\mathcal{J} = 1$  and a worse discord is found than that of pure states with the same classical correlation  $\mathcal{J}$ . In contrast, a mixture of a Bell state and a state of the computational basis of the opposite parity sector, gives a huge amount of discord. We thus consider states

$$\varrho = \epsilon|\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+| + (1 - \epsilon)|01\rangle\langle 01| \quad (2)$$

with  $|\Phi^+\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  as usual. With local unitary operations, which leave discord invariant, we can obtain from this ansatz any combination of a Bell state mixed with a computational basis state of opposite parity (number of 1's in the state). The expression of discord for states (2) is invariant under permutation of the individual labels  $A \leftrightarrow B$ . As a matter of fact we find that states (2) maximize the symmetrized version of discord  $(\delta_{A:B} + \delta_{B:A})/2$  for all rank 2 matrices.

It can be shown, when we compare with a numerical scan of Hilbert's space, that this state is too symmetric. In fact, a yet better option in terms of discord is obtained if some amount of entanglement is sacrificed for the good




FIG. 1: (Color online) Quantum discord ( $\delta_{A:B}$ ) versus classical correlations ( $\mathcal{J}$ ) for two-qubit states. The MDMS family (continuous line) gives two segments for rank 3 ( $\varrho^{(R3)}$ ) and one for rank 2 ( $\varrho^{(R2)}$ ). Layers of  $10^8$  random matrices of rank 2 (dark points), 3 (intermediate color) and 4 (lighter color) are superimposed. For pure states (dotted-dashed line)  $\delta_{A:B} = \mathcal{J} = E$ .

of quantum correlations. This results from asymmetrizing the maximally entangled (Bell) state leading to the ansatz

$$\varrho^{(R2)} = \epsilon|\tilde{\Phi}^+\rangle\langle\tilde{\Phi}^+| + (1 - \epsilon)|01\rangle\langle 01| \quad (3)$$

with  $|\tilde{\Phi}^+\rangle = \sqrt{p}|00\rangle + \sqrt{1-p}|11\rangle$ , which coincides with a Bell state for  $p = 1/2$ . The increase of discord for the states (3) with respect to (2) highlights the importance of the asymmetric definition of quantum discord, based on the asymmetric operation of measuring B in order to know about A. The discord for this family can be written once we know the conditional entropies  $\min_{\{\Pi_i^B\}} S(A|\{\Pi_i^B\}) = (x \log_2 \frac{1-x}{1+x} - \log_2 y)/2$  with  $x = \sqrt{1-4y}$  and  $y = \epsilon(1-p)(1-\epsilon)$ , while for  $\delta_{B:A}$  we need to use  $y = \epsilon p(1-\epsilon)$ . The total and reduced entropies are easy to calculate once we notice that the ansatz is given in spectral decomposition, though we do not give the whole expression for reasons of space.

The family of MDMS is obtained for an optimal function  $\epsilon_{\text{opt.}}(p)$  through the use of Lagrange multipliers, as detailed later in this letter. Once this optimal curve  $\epsilon_{\text{opt.}}(p)$  is used, equation (3) gives the family of states that maximize the quantum part of correlations for a given classical part, when all rank 2 (R2) states are considered. As shown in ) these  $\varrho^{(R2)}$  states are the MDMS for a large range of classical correlations.

In order to find the states which maximize quantumness of correlations, we also need to use rank 3 states. In this case it can be checked that asymmetrization of the Bell state component  $|\phi\rangle$  does not help, and that the

best choice for an ansatz is:

$$\varrho^{(R3)} = \epsilon|\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+| + (1-\epsilon)(m|01\rangle\langle 01| + (1-m)|10\rangle\langle 10|). \quad (4)$$

As before, any combination of Bell state plus two components of opposite parity belonging to the computational basis, will do. The optimal  $\epsilon_{\text{opt.}}(m)$  is discussed later and leads to the family of states  $\varrho^{(R3)}$  maximizing discord for small classical correlations. This optimal family has the property of being separable (not entangled), as shown in Fig. 2, while it maximizes quantum discord, highlighting the inequivalence of these measures of quantumness. It is actually found that for these states the discord amounts to the weight of the Bell component, and the simple relation  $\delta_{A:B} = \delta_{B:A} = \epsilon$  holds. For completeness, the entanglement (as quantified by the concurrence [17]) yields  $E(\varrho^{(R2)}) = 2\epsilon\sqrt{p(1-p)}$  and  $E(\varrho^{(R3)}) = \max[0, \epsilon - 2(1-\epsilon)\sqrt{m(1-m)}]$ . Although MDMS of rank 3 are separable, the MDMS of rank 2 have a high amount of entanglement, even if they do not maximize it (Fig. 2): as mentioned before, asymmetrization of the Bell component increases quantum correlations at the expense of entanglement.

An intriguing state is that of the singular point for  $\varrho^{(R3)}$  shown in Fig. 1:  $\varrho^{\text{cusp}} = (|\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+| + |01\rangle\langle 01| + |10\rangle\langle 10|)/3$  reaches the lowest possible purity for a rank 3 state and is separable, yet with a high level of discord. Another important feature emerging from Fig. 1 is that MDMS have a discord larger than pure states ( $\delta_{A:B} > \mathcal{J}$ ) and satisfy  $\mathcal{J} = 0$  only when  $\delta_{A:B} = 0$ , thus showing the lack of states with finite quantum without classical correlations. In other words, no state of two qubits is purely quantum. Maybe less surprisingly, there are no states with finite entanglement and zero classical correlations (Fig. 2).

*Detailed analysis.*— The discord is obtained expressing the measurement projectors as  $\Pi_j^B = |\psi_j^B\rangle\langle\psi_j^B|$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , with  $|\psi_1^B\rangle = \cos\theta|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}\sin\theta|1\rangle$  and  $|\psi_2^B\rangle = -e^{-i\phi}\sin\theta|0\rangle + \cos\theta|1\rangle$ . The angles minimizing Eq. (1) for the states (3), and thus giving the correct discord, are  $\theta = \pi/4 + n\pi/2$  and any value of  $\phi$ . We can choose then  $\phi = 0$  and hence the optimal projectors are  $\Pi_1^B = |^B\rangle\langle^B|$  and  $\Pi_2^B = |^{-B}\rangle\langle^{-B}|$ , with  $|\pm\rangle = (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ .

The method of Lagrange multipliers allows to maximize first the discord for the rank 2 family  $\delta_{A:B}(\varrho^{(R2)}) \equiv \delta(\epsilon, p)$  while keeping its classical correlations  $\mathcal{I}(\varrho^{(R2)}) \equiv I(\epsilon, p)$  constant (and the same for the rank 3 family  $\varrho^{(R3)}$ ). This is achieved through definition of the function  $\Lambda(\epsilon, p, \lambda) = \delta(\epsilon, p) + \lambda(\mathcal{J}(\epsilon, p) - \mathcal{J}_0)$  where  $\lambda$  is the Lagrange multiplier, and  $\mathcal{J}_0$  is an arbitrary but fixed amount of classical correlation. The extremization procedure is then simply the simultaneous solution to the three equations  $\partial_\mu \Lambda = 0$ , with  $\mu = \lambda, \epsilon, p$ . From the first equation,  $\mathcal{J}(\epsilon, p) = \mathcal{J}_0$  is obtained, as expected. From the last two equations we can isolate  $\lambda$  yielding the ex-




FIG. 2: (Color online) Entanglement ( $E$ ) versus classical correlations ( $\mathcal{J}$ ). Random matrices and lines for the MDMS family as in Fig. 1. MDMS of rank 3 are separable while  $\varrho^{(R2)}$  states show large entanglement, even if not maximum, as seen in the inset.

tremality condition

$$\partial_\epsilon \delta / \partial_\epsilon \mathcal{J} = \partial_p \delta / \partial_p \mathcal{J}. \quad (5)$$

We stress that this condition is equivalent to maximization of  $\delta$  versus  $\mathcal{I}$ , or minimization of  $\mathcal{J}$  with respect to  $\mathcal{I}$ , due to the closed relation  $\mathcal{I} = \delta + \mathcal{J}$ . These quantities present nontrivial trigonometric relations, leading to a transcendental equation whose solution can only be given numerically. The same procedure is followed for the rank 3 family, with  $m$  playing the role of  $p$ .

The obtention of  $\epsilon_{\text{opt.}}(m)$  for the rank 3 family  $\varrho^{(R3)}$  is a bit trickier, due to the fact that there are two optimal angles (each of them good for different ranges of  $\epsilon$  and  $m$ ),  $\theta = 0, \pi/4$ ; the angle  $\phi$  is again non important. We can for the moment consider that projector maximization of discord has been simplified to  $\delta_{A:B}(\varrho^{(R3)}) = \min(\delta_0, \delta_{\pi/4})$ , the latter being functions of  $\epsilon$  and  $m$ . The goal is to find the zero(es) of the function  $\partial_\epsilon \delta / \partial_\epsilon \mathcal{J} - \partial_p \delta / \partial_p \mathcal{J}$ , which of course needs the knowledge of when to use one angle or the other. However the problem greatly reduces by noticing that the latter function is positive when using  $\delta_0$  and negative when using  $\delta_{\pi/4}$ . This means that the zero of such function occurs exactly (and conveniently) when  $\delta_0 = \delta_{\pi/4}$ . Thus the solution to the Lagrange problem for rank 3 is equivalent to the condition  $\delta_0(\epsilon, m) = \delta_{\pi/4}(\epsilon, m)$ . Again, the solution to this transcendental equation can only be given numerically.

Finally, the MDMS are a family of states

$$\varrho^{\text{MDMS}} = \epsilon|\tilde{\Phi}^+\rangle\langle\tilde{\Phi}^+| + (1-\epsilon)(m|01\rangle\langle 01| + (1-m)|10\rangle\langle 10|). \quad (6)$$

where the optimum choice of parameters gives the three curves in Fig. 1, two of them rank 3, the other rank 2.

The first curve, going from zero discord up to the cusp (Fig. 1, red line), is the rank 3 family  $\rho^{(R3)}$  with  $\epsilon_{\text{opt.}}(m)$  given by the solution of  $\delta_0 = \delta_{\pi/4}$ . It is restricted to the domain  $m \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\epsilon \in [0, 1/3]$ . The second branch of MDMS is given by  $\rho^{(R3)}$  with  $m = 1/2$  (Fig. 1, green line) with domain  $\epsilon \in [1/3, 0.385]$ , approximately. These two curves correspond separable states, as noted above (Fig. 2). The remaining curve of MDMS (Fig. 1, black line) is the rank 2 family  $\rho^{(R2)}$  when the optimal function  $\epsilon_{\text{opt.}}(p)$  given by Eq. (5) is used, and for  $\epsilon$  approximately in the interval  $[0.408, 1]$ .

*Statistics.*— To our knowledge, just a single fact on the statistics of quantum discord is known: zero discord states have measure zero [14]. Since our random generation of density matrices is uniform in the Hilbert space, preserving the Haar measure [18, 19], we can measure the frequency of appearance of states with different properties, as shown in Fig. 3 for different ranks. Some main features arise for all quantities investigated: i) Zero correlations (be it quantum, classical or mutual information) have zero probability. Notably, entanglement is the exception (consistently with Ref. [19]), where only rank 2 states have a probability zero of being separable. ii) The lower the rank, the higher the typical amount of correlations. This is quite understandable, since higher ranks describe more mixed states. iii) It is more probable to find states with more abundance of classical rather than quantum correlations. We note that only  $\sim 7.45\%$  of the two-qubit states has greater discord than classical correlations. If restricted to lower ranks, we observe that rank 2 matrices yield  $\sim 10.76\%$ , and rank 3 yield  $\sim 16.3\%$ . Finally, as shown in the insets in Fig. 3, the border of MDMS seems to be rather improbable to find in the space of two qubit states, except for the middle branch in the cusp, meaning that such extremely non-classical states are quite rare.

*Conclusions.*— We have studied two-qubit mixed states and found those with maximal proportion of quantum discord versus classical correlations (or, equivalently, versus total correlations), the MDMS in Eq. (6). Part of them has rank 2 and is highly -though not maximally-entangled, while the other part has rank 3 and is separable, thus providing another evidence of the inequivalence of these two measures of quantumness. We have shown that the presence of discord is a sufficient but not necessary condition to have not vanishing classical correlations. The uniform generation of states (random states preserving Haar measure) allowed us to find the probabilities and typical values of classical and quantum correlations, as well as entanglement. We verified that completely (either quantum or classical) uncorrelated states are very rare, as well as extreme nonclassical states.

Funding from FISICOS (FIS2007-60327) and CoQuSys (200450E566) projects and Juan de la Cierva program are acknowledged.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Probability (density) to find a two-qubit state with a given amount of quantum discord  $\delta$ , classical correlations  $\mathcal{J}$ , and entanglement  $E$  respectively, for ranks 2 (dashed), 3 (dot-dashed), and 4 (dot-dot-dashed). The insets show these probabilities (larger for light color) for the quantity under study ( $y$  axis) against classical correlations  $\mathcal{J}$  ( $x$  axis), for different ranks.

- 
- [1] A. Einstein *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
  - [2] R. Horodecki *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
  - [3] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2000).
  - [4] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2002).
  - [5] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A **34**, 6899 (2001).
  - [6] M. Horodecki *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 100402 (2003).
  - [7] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5672 (1998); S. L. Braunstein *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1054 (1999); D. A. Meyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2014 (2000); E. Biham *et al.*, Theor. Comput. Sci. **320**, 15 (2004); A. Datta *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050502 (2008); B. P. Lanyon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 200501 (2008); V. Vedral, arXiv:0906.3656; Found. Phys. (2010).
  - [8] J. Maziero *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 044102 (2009).
  - [9] L. Mazzola *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 200401 (2010).
  - [10] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042303 (2008).
  - [11] M. Ali *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042105 (2010).
  - [12] P. Giorda and M. G. A. Paris, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 020503 (2010); G. Adesso and A. Datta, arXiv:1003.4979.
  - [13] S. Ishizaka and T. Hiroshima, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 022310 (2000); F. Verstraete *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 012316 (2001).
  - [14] A. Ferraro *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 052318 (2010).
  - [15] A. Shabani and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 100402 (2009).
  - [16] J.-S. Xu *et al.*, Nat. Commun. **1**, 7 (2010).



- [17] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998)
- [18] K. Zyczkowski and M. Kus, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **27**, 4235 (1994).
- [19] K. Zyczkowski *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 883 (1998).